

25X1

MEMORANDUM FOR:
Chief, Admin Staff, FBIS

25X1

FROM :

SUBJECT : OGA

1. Thanks for your note dtd 4 September regarding the structure and mission of OGA. I appreciate your taking the time to put some thoughts down on paper and sending them over.

2. There is no question in my mind that OGA, or any other office for that matter, needs a clear-cut mission statement, functions, positions, and dollars. At this point, we have none of the foregoing. Come 1 October, OGA will be the "home base" for MG careerists, but all of the careerists are on other people's T/O! In other words, OGA would be a "body shop."

3. I am not sure, but according to the scenario you portray, the support officers, with slots, would be transferred from DO, DS&T, DI to OGA???? This is not a particularly good time for that to happen because as the budget and slot reductions come, we would be caught up in a DDA cut (now those slots are somewhat protected within the bowels of other components. But I may be misunderstanding your suggestion...

4. Please make an appointment so we can discuss your ideas. Thanks for your support....

25X1



4 September 1990

25X1 Memorandum For: [redacted]
Director, Office of General Administration

25X1 From: [redacted]
Chief, Administrative Staff, FBIS

25X1 Subject: Thoughts on Structure and Mission of OGA

Following are a few early thoughts on the mission and structure of OGA:

Mission: to oversee and administer the provision of DA goods and services to Agency and select Intelligence Community components both domestically and overseas. Explanation: the MG service has evolved from a variety of administrative support groups bred by individual offices in the DA (e.g. Commo), DI and DO (Ops Support Assistants). The creation of the new office is merely the next step in this evolution. A wide range of administratively oriented officers from the SSA to OSO's in the DO continue to carry out the basic role described in our statement of mission. Included in this broad statement of mission is the SSA role of interpreting the regulations and making ad hoc exceptions to policy on the basis of special authorities derived from the DCI.

Structure: the structure of our new organization must encompass the full range of role players who carry out our mission. Those who fall into this grouping are our "operations" personnel. The players are the SSA and all Support officers at Headquarters and in the field. This group should also include the OSO's. In addition, the structure requires a group of those who support our operations personnel. This role has heretofore been played by the Career Management Staff and the DA Management Staff.

Creation of the Office of General Administration will necessitate more than bringing together all related parties. Some existing structures and procedures will have to be altered, perhaps eliminated. The office of SSA is a prime example. It has authorities that perhaps should be vested in the office of D/OGA. It also has responsibilities that should be carried out by an operations group chief. The SSA as we now know it should probably be abolished but its scope of responsibility is clearly something to be incorporated into the new office. In my mind, the SSA would emerge as a group chief responsible for overseas operations. Another group chief responsible for domestic operations would also be established.

The Career Management Staff with its established role in support of recruiting, selecting, assigning, evaluating, promoting and training MG personnel would require a less radical change than would the SSA. It might be expanded to include budget and fiscal responsibilities in order to form yet a third group chief in charges of "resources".

Chiefs of Support who have responsibility for subcomponents are logical choices for division chief roles under the operations groups. As division chiefs they and their deputies would exercise supervisory roles and, among other duties, assume responsibility for performance evaluation of the support officers under their scope of authority. For example, the LA Division support chief would supervise all support officers at LA field stations. Division chief roles should be structured to supervise domestic support positions as well as overseas positions. In effect, clear lines of authority should be developed in the new office. This would enhance our ability to assess and develop our personnel. The career service has not always been well served by having our personnel evaluated by representatives of the components in which they serve. An administrative perspective on the performance of an administrative officer is preferable. Serving two masters who don't always share compatible objectives is a problem area that can easily be resolved by placing our personnel under the supervision of more senior administrative officers. Formation of the new office presents a perfect opportunity to effect this change.

As noted, these ideas just scratch the surface. Hopefully there's something here that will be of help. I'd be happy to discuss it with you in greater detail at your convenience. I should add that I'm very enthusiastic about the creation of OGA. I realize that it's not a universally accepted development. But I see it as positive, and as an opportunity to institutionalize our strength and to eliminate some serious weaknesses. During its examination of the MG service last fall, I suggested to the IG that we become an Office. In fact, as a panel chairman at the 1982 Headquarters MG Conference, I recommended it. I feel that I have a stake in the outcome. You can count on my full support of your efforts.

25X1

